

**REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the office action mailed August 1, 2007. Applicant further thanks the Examiner for the in person interview held October 17, 2007, and the present amended is intended to implement the conclusions of our meeting. The present amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance is hereby solicited.

Applicant herein cancels claims 131 – 132 without prejudice, and presents new claim 133 addressed to a corresponding method. Thus, claims 130 and 133 remain in the case.

Support for the amendments may be found in the originally filed specification and claims, and in particular the section before the detailed description associated with Figs. 14A - 15. No new matter is added by these amendments.

**SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW**

An in office interview was held on October 17, 2007. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and 35 U.S.C. 103 as well as the prior art of record was discussed.

As regards the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, it was explained that the meaning of the clause is that in the absence of mains fed power, power is supplied to the memory from the secondary power supply.

As regards the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, it was noted that the power sources of Horning are both internally located, with a first one being a mains fed power supply and a second being a battery fed power supply. Such a battery is easily optimally sized for the computer, as opposed to power received from an external power source. Particularly, power for the back up supply is not received from an external source.